

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 93 04:30:14 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #364  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                Tue, 5 Oct 93                Volume 93 : Issue 364

Today's Topics:

    Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective) (2 msgs)  
    The Canadian Perspective Returns (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

---

Date: 4 Oct 93 13:34:48 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>groups scattered seemingly randomly through the text)? At that point, you  
>can be 99% sure that the examinee's answers come not from his/her code copy,  
>but from his/her neighbor's test.

So why do you have 'em seated so close together? Or are we blessed with  
having enough room to spread 'em out to make such cheating difficult? VEs not  
observing what's going on? we have to watch it when we're using the lecture  
hall (theater style seating on a incline) but usually we're able to spread  
folks out.

hummm..we're running IR headphones, maybe if there were more than 1 frequency  
seemingly available, we could mix different speeds in the same room.

I guess it might be interesting to make up multiple answer sheets (same  
answers but in different orders) but it would make grading difficult.

Or maybe an answer sheet with less easily seen ways to indicate an answer.

We haven't exactly been overwhelmed with folks taking code tests either (maybe 4 for every 10 the last couple of times around)....

bill wb9ivr

---

Date: 4 Oct 1993 11:24 EDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!msuinfo!uchinews!cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!  
nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep30.212417.7066@microsoft.com>, laurahal@microsoft.com (Laura Halliday) writes...

>  
>Funny you should mention a Canadian perspective: there is a proposal  
>in the Canadian Amateur to change HF Morse requirements from the  
>current:

>  
> 0 WPM = all modes > 30 MHz  
> 5 WPM = all modes > 30 MHz, all modes 160m & 80m  
> 12 WPM = all modes, all bands

>  
>To something like this:  
>

>  
> 0 WPM = all modes > 30 MHz  
> 5 WPM = CW < 30 MHz, all modes > 30 MHz (maybe voice on 10m)  
> 12 WPM = all modes, all bands.

>  
>This would give non-CW folks a low-effort low-risk taste of serious HF  
>(e.g. 20 and 30 meters) and would thus encourage more folks to upgrade.

>  
>73 from Burnaby,  
>laura VE7LDH

I would support a scheme like this. I think that it offers a good compromise and offers some benefits. However, I still think at 5 wpm voice should be permitted somewhere other than 10m since this is such a flaky band right now.

I agree that we should go back to the max of 13wpm that we had in the years immediately preceding incentive licensing. I'm not really sure that 12/13wpm is really required for anything, except of course enjoying cw contacts as ones major interest.

Erich  
N30XM

---

Date: 4 Oct 93 13:51:30 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: The Canadian Perspective Returns  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>machines in the past. Every one of those machines was a club operation  
>that was intended mainly as an autopatch substitute for a cellular  
>phone, and every one of them had numerous rules and procedures enforced  
>by zealous channel cops. A small group of us erected our current repeater

Yes. That seems to be borne out here locally as well.

autopatch machines have a lot of worrying about things, the non-autopatch  
machines just seem to be more like what amateur radio is supposed to be.

the non-patch systems actually have TWO-WAY communications going on between  
people instead of calls to find out if they need 2% or homo milk and  
was that in quarts, half-gallons or gallon jugs....

maybe now that cell phones exist, it's maybe time to downplay the need for  
autopathing. sure it has it's place, but think of all the headaches an  
organization can avoid as well.

bill wb9ivr.

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 1993 17:39:03 GMT  
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: The Canadian Perspective Returns  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Subject: Re: The Canadian Perspective Returns  
From: Mr. Nice Guy, rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu  
In article <1993Oct2.020416.25172@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> Mr. Nice Guy,  
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu writes:  
>In article <CE8Jw8.Gu1@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu  
(Jeff  
>Herman) writes:  
>>In article <1993Oct1.143339.28478@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>

lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu  
>(Larry Kollar) writes:  
>>>jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>[Gary Coffman]  
>>>>we hear stories of jamming of repeaters and foul language as well,  
>>>>some of which may be done by newly minted amateurs who have not been  
>>>>formally tested for Morse skills, but mostly done by Morse tested  
>>>> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^  
>>>>amateurs of the same kind who infest HF. In the areas where this  
>>>> ^^^^^^  
>>>  
>>>Trying to pass opinion as fact again? And your rebuttal: "On MY  
repeater,  
>>>we DF every jammer and almost always it's a Morse tested amateur  
<blah,  
>>>blah, blah>..."  
>>  
>>>I wonder if you're deliberately overlooking the obvious here. In the  
>>part of Gary's article you deleted, he mentioned that the rude behavior  
>>long pre-dates the no-code license. Therefore, at least up until 2.5  
>>years ago, any (make that \*\*\*ANY\*\*\*) W/K/N/A ham who was jamming,  
either  
>>>on HF or VHF/UHF, was a "Morse tested amateur." Now, is that opinion  
or  
>>>fact? (A tiny minority exempted because of physical handicaps doesn't  
>>>invalidate the argument.)  
>>  
>>  
>>You might be overlooking the obvious here: who says the jammers of  
>>today or yesteryear are even licensed? No where did I imply that  
>>the jammers were no-code techs; I don't believe that is the case  
>>at all. The point I am trying to make is that he and others should  
>>stop trying to blame the ills of amateur radio on coded licensees;  
>  
>Jeff, this is a reaction to the claim that passing the code part of the  
>test makes the ham a better operator and less likely to do such things.  
>  
>Many of the flames are due to claims that the code requirement is  
>an effective lid filter. The slams at the non-codeless are a reaction to  
>their claims that they are better operators just because they know how to  
>receive code at 13 or 20 wpm.  
>  
>  
>  
>>it's a stupid arguement (typical of people who can't defend them-  
>>selves - they resort to striking offensively with empty accusations).

>>Some folks on here are so intimidated by the code that they have to  
>>make up 'facts' to try to get their points across.  
>  
>  
>No, just tired about claims by the non-codeless hams that being able to  
receive  
>code at 13 or 20 wpm makes them \_superior\_ to lesser hams and a sure sign  
>that God favors them.  
>  
>Down with the non-codeless hams !   8-)  
                                                                                      ~~~~~

I've probably already made it clear that I strongly favor a free-marketplace of ideas and technologies (and, yes, modes also) so I won't bother to compliment the logic here (oh, OK, Rod is making a lot of good sense. Who let him in here?)

I would like to make a suggestion to clean up some of the linguistics however. I propose a nice clean term such as \*Coded\* for the pro-code segment of hams (as opposed to the term \*non-codeless\* used above). I propose \*Code-Free\* for those who prefer to remain unsullied by the skills of the telegraph.

If we start using clearer terms, maybe our thought processes will become clearer in response. ;>)

>--  
>Rod Anderson | "I do not think the United States  
government  
>rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of  
>                                                                                  fanatics decided to kill themselves"  
>Clinton, Gore, gone in four |                                           Slick Willie the Compassionate

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers ? We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."  
- Thomas Jefferson

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 1993 17:30:50 GMT

From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: The Canadian Perspective Returns  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Subject: Re: The Canadian Perspective Returns  
From: Mr. Nice Guy, rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu  
In article <1993Oct2.020416.25172@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> Mr. Nice Guy,  
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu writes:  
>In article <CE8Jw8.Gu1@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu  
(Jeff  
>Herman) writes:  
>>In article <1993Oct1.143339.28478@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>  
lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu  
>(Larry Kollar) writes:  
>>>jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>[Gary Coffman]  
>>>>we hear stories of jamming of repeaters and foul language as well,  
>>>>some of which may be done by newly minted amateurs who have not been  
>>>>formally tested for Morse skills, but mostly done by Morse tested  
>>>> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^  
>>>>amateurs of the same kind who infest HF. In the areas where this  
>>> ^^^^^^  
>>>  
>>>Trying to pass opinion as fact again? And your rebuttal: "On MY  
repeater,  
>>>we DF every jammer and almost always it's a Morse tested amateur  
<blah,  
>>>blah, blah>..."  
>>>  
>>>I wonder if you're deliberately overlooking the obvious here. In the  
>>part of Gary's article you deleted, he mentioned that the rude behavior  
>>long pre-dates the no-code license. Therefore, at least up until 2.5  
>>years ago, any (make that \*\*\*ANY\*\*\*) W/K/N/A ham who was jamming,  
either  
>>>on HF or VHF/UHF, was a "Morse tested amateur." Now, is that opinion  
or  
>>>fact? (A tiny minority exempted because of physical handicaps doesn't  
>>>invalidate the argument.)  
>>>  
>>  
>>You might be overlooking the obvious here: who says the jammers of  
>>today or yesteryear are even licensed? No where did I imply that  
>>the jammers were no-code techs; I don't believe that is the case  
>>at all. The point I am trying to make is that he and others should  
>>stop trying to blame the ills of amateur radio on coded licensees;  
>

>Jeff, this is a reaction to the claim that passing the code part of the  
>test makes the ham a better operator and less likely to do such things.  
>  
>Many of the flames are due to claims that the code requirement is  
>an effective lid filter. The slams at the non-codeless are a reaction to  
>their claims that they are better operators just because they know how to  
>receive code at 13 or 20 wpm.  
>  
>  
>  
>>it's a stupid arguement (typical of people who can't defend them-  
>>selves - they resort to striking offensively with empty accusations).  
>>Some folks on here are so intimidated by the code that they have to  
>>make up 'facts' to try to get their points across.  
>  
>  
>No, just tired about claims by the non-codeless hams that being able to  
receive  
>code at 13 or 20 wpm makes them \_superior\_ to lesser hams and a sure sign  
>that God favors them.  
>  
>Down with the non-codeless hams !

I've probably already made it clear that I strongly favor a free-marketplace of ideas and technologies (and, yes, modes also) so I won't bother to compliment the logic here (oh, OK, Rod is making a lot of good sense. Who let him on this board?)

I would like to make a suggestion to clean up some of the linguistics however. I propose a nice clean term such as \*Coded\* for the pro-code segment of hams (as opposed to the above term \*non-codeless\*). I propose \*Code-Free\* for those who prefer to remain unsullied by the skills of the telegraph.

If we start using clearer terms, maybe our thought processes will become clearer in response. ;->

>--  
>Rod Anderson | "I do not think the United States  
government  
>rlanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of  
> | fanatics decided to kill themselves"  
>Clinton, Gore, gone in four | Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: 4 Oct 93 17:38:51 GMT

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!lkollar@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CE6z14.4B7@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1993Oct1.143339.28478@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <CE8Jw8.Gu1@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject : Re: The Canadian Perspective Returns

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

> The point I am trying to make is that he and others should  
>stop trying to blame the ills of amateur radio on coded licensees;  
>it's a stupid arguement (typical of people who can't defend them-  
>selves - they resort to striking offensively with empty accusations).

I think what you may be seeing is a subtle turning of the tables... some of the force-coders blame everything -- including stuff that happened years ago -- on no-code. So, some no-code advocates turn the argument around to illustrate how ridiculous that kind of argument really is.

>Some folks on here are so intimidated by the code that they have to  
>make up 'facts' to try to get their points across.

And so do some folks on the other side, who start with a valid argument then suddenly veer off into la-la land. You should have seen the doozy that landed in my mailbox this morning.

--  
Larry Kollar, KC4WZK | I like CW, but that doesn't mean I think every ham  
lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu | should have to learn it.

"You mean you came back from the dead, to tell me I'm \*odd\*?"

---

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #364

\*\*\*\*\*